DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 361 878 EA 025 259

AUTHOR Carver, Fred D.
TITLE The Effectiveness of LEAD Program Elements.
PUB DATE Apr 93
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Atlanta, GA April 12-16, 1993).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Administration; Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; Internship Programs; *Leadership; *Leadership Training; *Management Development; *Program Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS *Gwinnett County School System GA

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the Leadership Enhancement and Development (LEAD) preparation program implemented in Gwinnett County School District, Georgia, and designed to prepare participants for assistant principalships in the school district. Those selected for the program completed year-long coursework and a 12-week internship. This report presents data from a longitudinal study at the University of Georgia (the Georgia LEAD Study, or GLS). Data were obtained from GLS questionnaires administered to four cohorts of 12-15 individuals each, GLS interviews with participants, and intradistrict LEAD evaluations. Findings indicate that the program successfully included direct field-based learning in cooperation with the school district. Program strengths included strong basic content, direct field-based learning experience, and use of the cohort as an intact learning group. Five ways in which the practicum prepared participants for practice were identified--making career choices, refining goals, engaging in realistic practice, improving personal competence, and promoting personal professional development. Two tables are included. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 361 878

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF LEAD PROGRAM ELEMENTS

Fred D. (Don) Carver

University of Georgia

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F. D. Carver

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

In-depth discussion paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, Georgia, April, 1993

EA 025 259

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF LEAD PROGRAM ELEMENTS

Fred D. (Don) Carver
University of Georgia

The purposes of this paper are to describe the LEAD preparation program and to present data from LEAD participants about that program. Primary data from participants came from a longitudinal study underway at the University of Georgia (GLS, the Georgia LEAD Study). Following a brief statement about the larger, on-going research study, the program of study leading to initial leadership certification will be described. Evaluation data will then be presented and discussed.

The GLS

Gwinnett County School District was one of the most rapidly growing districts in the USA in the 1980's. While the growth rate has slowed slightly in the last couple of years and the District has lost its status as the fastest growing district in the country, its student population is expected to reach 100,000 by the year 2000 from its current (approx.) 68,000. As with many larger districts, Gwinnett selects a majority of its leadership personnel from within. Because of a strong desire to have an adequate supply of qualified personnel and to ensure that some individuals eligible for entry level leadership positions were focused on instruction, District leadership personnel worked with key individuals at the University of Georgia during 1987-88 to design a program to prepare leadership personnel for the district.

That unique program, Leadership Enhancement And Development, is now in its fifth year. The general features of the program are a cohort (12-15 individuals) selected

by (district and building) personnel in Gwinnett and a UGA professor, year-long coursework (35 quarter hours), and a 12-week internship (5 quarter hours). Completion leads to certification for an entry level leadership position in Georgia. Participants are required to hold a master's degree and be recommended by their principal. During the internship, substitute teachers/counselors are employed so that the participants are available for full time interning in school leadership.

There have now been five cohorts selected: 14 in '88; 13 in '89; 12 in '90; 14 in '91; and 14 in '92. Preparation has been completed and leadership certification obtained by cohorts '88-'91. The '92 cohort started preparation in the summer of '92 and will be completed at the end of spring quarter, 1993. Plans are proceeding to initiate a sixth group in the summer of '93.

In the Fall of 1991, a set of instruments was constructed to initiate study of the experiences of participants (one year, two years, and three years after completing preparation) as they enter and advance in school leadership or continue in teaching. The instrument items were based on (a) goals of the LEAD program; (b) patterns of questions following the national Beginning Principal Study conducted with 12 first-time high school principals in five states (Parkay, Rhodes, and Currie, 1990; Parkay and Hall, 1992; and Parkay, Currie, and Rhodes, 1992); and (c) literature reflecting elements of cohort preparation, administrative preparation, and administrative entry (Ryan, et al, 1980; Daresh, 1988; and Weindling and Early, 1987). In year four, and subsequent years after program completion semi-structured personal interviews (were) will be conducted.

The GLS surveys focused on two kinds of questions. Descriptive information about the personal and professional background of participants was requested. Open ended questions regarding the cohort preparation experience, others who played significant roles in the cohorts' preparation, and significant events during the 1,2, or 3 years following preparation required respondents to probe their thoughts and feelings and reflect on their behaviors. Semi-structured interviews continue the probing regarding preparation and career development.

To date there have been two phases of data collection. In 1991, individuals in the '88 cohort (who, in 1991, were entering their third year after preparation) responded to the entire set of instruments, '89 cohort individuals responded to first and second year instruments, and members of the '90 cohort completed only the first year questionnaire. Baseline (background) information was obtained from all four cohorts: 32 of 39 in cohorts 1,2, and 3 and all 14 from cohort 4.

In fall 1992, time - appropriate data were collected from members of the five cohorts: interviews were conducted with Cohort 1 -- entering their fourth year after preparation; third year data were collected from Cohort 2; second year from Cohort 3; first year from Cohort 4; and background data from Cohort 5, the current group. Response rates by groups and years after preparation range from 75% to 100%. Personal and professional background data have now been obtained from 60 of the 67 participants.

The LEAD Program: A Description

The LEAD program consists of three quarters of ten quarter hours of coursework each quarter beginning in the summer. The fourth, quarter of the program is devoted to an additional five hour academic course and a full-time internship (five quarter hours) -- replacement teachers/counselors are employed. Participants are required to hold a master's degree and the program is designed to provide the knowledge and skills and the opportunity to demonstrate the competencies required to enter leadership in Gwinnett County School District as an assistant principalship. The program specifically is designed to meet the State's licensing requirement for entry into school leadership. District leadership and University professors and administrators designed a program that was collaborative in participant selection and content development and delivery (see Bruce, 1993).

Course Work

When LEAD was conceived, the State of Georgia "course content requirements" for an entry level, general leadership credential were: "twenty-five quarter hours in courses dealing with elementary and secondary school administration and supervision" and five quarter hours in a course dealing with curriculum and instruction for school administrators and supervisions" (State Department of Education, 1979, p. 33). From inception, LEAD was 35 quarter hours of coursework constructed to emphasize instructional leadership and to ensure entry level certification. The courses that comprised the initial program (for 1988-89) readily met the State's requirements:

(5) Introduction to School Administration

(5) Introduction to Supervision

(5) Curriculum Development

(5) Staff Development

(5) Personnel Management

(5) Instructional Supervision

(5) Staff Development Seminar

Content of the first six courses is (reasonably) accurately conveyed by the title; differences in the course in personnel management would differ from a similarly titled course in Oklahoma largely only because of Georgia laws governing personnel and the Georgia evaluation system. The staff development seminar was a series of monthly seminars on diverse topics intended to "create a community or network by using formal and informal discussion, while dealing with "mind-stretching topics" that would broaden the scope of all who were involved in the program "(J. Kahrs, personal communication, 1989, p.3). The same course content remained in place for the second cohort in 1989-90 although sequencing changes were made.

Course content was changed for the third cohort (1990-91) by removing the staff development seminar (5 quarter hours) and replacing it with a school business management course. This change resulted, in large part, from a change in State certification requirements that became effective in July, 1990. The previous "twenty-five" and "five"requirement became:

> . . . . a common content core of a minimum of 30 quarter hours of graduate course work in which all specified competencies are addressed. . . . All core

course work should reflect. . . . in each of the following areas:

1) curriculum development e.g.,principles, procedures and components of curriculum development, interpretation of test scores, use of assessment data, program evaluation)

2) supervision of instruction (e.g.,instructional program design, effective teaching, classroom management, instructional strategies, teaching models)

3) organizational leadership (e.g.,generic leadership theory and skills-planning, goal setting, implementing, monitoring, problem-solving; organizational development and change, interpersonal and group relations - staff, students, and community; communication presentation skills; school climate)

4) development and management of personnel (e.g.,recruitment, selection, hiring, use of job descriptions, personnel utilization/staffing, supervision/personnel evaluation, conferencing, staff development, adult learning theory, promoting change)

5) school business management (e.g.,fiscal management - budgeting, purchasing, warehousing; scheduling and time management; records management; physical facilities planning, maintenance and operation; resource management)

6) school law, standards, policy (e.g.,legal foundations; basics of school law and finance; policy analysis - federal, state, Board of Education, local; state and local standards)

. . . . a 5 quarter hour field experience in school administration and/or instructional leadership (State Department of Education, 1989, pp. 4-5).

Content was changed again for the fourth (1991-92) and fifth (1992-93) cohort by substituting a course emphasizing leadership for effective schools for the school business management course. This change occurred because of the judgment that the specific competencies in "school business management" were essentially being taken care of in the introduction to school administration and during the internship. Finally, a course

in group development is to be added to the sequence of courses for the sixth cohort (1993-94) and the introduction to supervision is being dropped.

In summary, from the beginning, course content has focused on curriculum and the supervision of instruction directly and indirectly through a strong emphasis on staff development and management and an understanding of the legal, policy, and structural context for practice. Content has been presented over a four quarter period with the final quarter (actually twelve weeks) reserved for the full-time internship and a supervision of instruction course which capitalizes on the internship for significant clinical work in classrooms with teachers.

Internship

Even though there was no State requirement for a field experience until 1992, a key feature of LEAD from the beginning was a twelve-week,full time internship. For the first two years, participants interned only in their "home"school. The key individual in a participants' being selected for LEAD was (and continues to be) her/his principal. Principals are provided with fully certified teachers as replacements for LEAD participants during the internship. Only after two participants were selected from one school in the third year of the program was there variance from the "home school internship". About one-third of the participants in the fourth and fifth cohort interned in a "different"school, some changing levels, e.g.,from high school to middle school. Principals have also been seen as the key member of a school's leadership team in providing coaching and mentoring to participants.

In all instances other members of a school's leadership team, i.e., assistant principals, have been observed and/or have supervised parts of the internship. It is the principal, however, who is responsible for ensuring that specific kinds of activities are experienced, for ensuring that the intern is oriented to the school, and for (at least) weekly discussions about the critical events and decisions in the school.

Accompanying the clinical activities in the internship is a weekly two hour seminar that meets during school hours, e.g., 2:30-4:30pm. These seminars are times for sharing and discussing experiences of interns (real in-school critical events and decisions made or observed), role playing, simulations, and for developing a personal platform for leadership. The primary perspective presented as a way of interpreting and integrating clinical experiences into one's understanding of self as an emerging formal leader is reflection in an action (Schon, 1983, 1987, 1991).

Faculty

University faculty who teach LEAD courses, including supervision of the internship, are regular members of the Department of Educational Leadership. (The Department of Educational Administration and Curriculum and Supervision were merged in 1990 to form Educational Leadership. The program was jointly offered by EA and C&S for two years.) Interest in working in a school district setting in a collaborative environment is the distinguishing characteristic of the professors. Most of the courses involve appropriate District personnel in the delivery of instruction, thus helping to contextualize theories, principles, and practices. This also has the effect of further legitimating instruction by adding the on-line practitioners perspectives. For

example, personnel development and management courses have consistently relied on District practitioners who work in the task area of human resource management to help teach those courses.

Summary

The intact group is an important part of the program. Cohort members receive all of the 35 quarter hours of course content with (only) the intact group and they come to the preparation having been recommended by their principal and selected by significant District personnel. Thus, they come with individuals already identified as sounding boards, coaches and possible mentors. They "learn" program content in a supportive environment and intra-cohort networks become an additional and important source of support. University faculty who teach in the program elect to do so and internship placements are either known environments or arranged by the intern with assistance and support of previously identified "significant others." In short, it is designed to be a positive and successful, if taxing, experience. Let us turn to some evaluative data about the program.

Evaluation of the Program

There are two sources for the data that will be presented in this next section on program effectiveness: GLS questionnaires and interviews; and intra-district evaluations of LEAD. Four cohorts have responded to the first year GLS instrument at this time. Their responses to three questions comprise the first evaluation data.

1. What do you consider to be the 3 or 4 highlights of your preparation?
2. How did the LEAD program prepare you to begin the practice of education leadership?

3. If you are in a leadership role, can you identify differences in the way you view the nature/challenge of leadership?

OR

(If not in leadership) can you identify ways in which you approach your work differently?

Four cohorts responded to an additional question in the first year GLS instrument: "What one, two, or three experiences do you wish had been included that were not?" A follow up question was included in the second and third year GLS instruments, for individuals in leadership positions: "Now that you are in the second (or third) year in a leadership position, what do you wish had been included in the LEAD preparation?" Participants in formal leadership positions from three cohorts responded to the second year follow-up question, two cohorts to the third-year follow up, and one (the first) cohort responded to the same question in a interview.

Interviews were conducted by Kahrs (personal communication, 1989, 1990, 1991) and reports were prepared about the LEAD program for cohorts one, two, and three. Kahrs' data specifically address coursework, the internship, the program as a whole.

GLS Data

In the Fall following program completion, LEAD participants were asked what they considered to be the three or four highlights of their preparation. At the time of data collection, 23 of the 45 respondents were in a formal leadership position (Instructional Lead Teacher, Assistant Principal, or Administrative Assistant -- in 1991, Gwinnett County School District dropped the ILT title and changed all ILT's to AP's); only two LEAD participants appointed to a formal leadership position the first year

after the program did not respond. The other 22 respondents to the first year survey were in teaching, counseling, or media services positions, mostly the positions they were in prior to interning; the response rate of those not in formal leadership was 78% (22 of 28) in comparison to 92% (23 of 25) for those in formal leadership.

Table 1. Highlights of LEAD Preparation as Reported by Participants in Formal Leadership Positions and Those Not

HIGHLIGHTS	Responses of Participants In Formal Leadership (N=23)			Responses of Participants Not In Formal Leadership (N=22)			Total (N=45)		
	F	%Total	%Respondents	F	%Total	%Respondents	F	%Total	%Respondents
Internship	16	26	70	12	24	54	28	25	62
Lead Colleagues (COHORT)	13	21	56	12	24	54	25	22	56
Instructors	11	18	48	8	16	36	19	17	42
Courses	10	16	43	9	18	41	19	17	42
Other (several)	12	19	NA	8	16	NA	20	18	NA
Total	62	100	NA	49	98	NA	111	99	NA

Four items accounted for over three fourths of the highlights identified: internship, LEAD colleagues, instructors, and courses (See Table 1). While there were differences in reported highlights depending on whether one was in a formal leadership position -- those in leadership who identified the internship more frequently than those who were not, the similarity of the responses is striking. Several individuals literally cited the two or three "top"highlights in an integrated fashion.

> The internship was a good hands-on experience to let me know what leadership was all about. Building strong networks with peers. Good preparation, coursework in supervision and top-not professors. (AO2)

> Getting to know and learn from outstanding professors who forced me to dig down deep and really think for the first time in years. Relationships formed with colleagues from varying levels; we learned a great deal from each other. The internship with an outstanding principal who showed me how to put the theory into practice. The fact that he hired me was also a highpoint. (BO6)

Group dynamics of being with the same group; internship experience. (D10)

Other individuals were less holistic in their response. For them an individual course or the intense involvement with peers was the highlight.

The course with _____ on _____. That gave me my direction and focus. (CO8)

The companionship and collegiality of new friends. (CO4)

Still others identified very personal outcomes or experiences.

. . . . the opportunity to grow professionally. (DO7)

. . . . Accomplishment of working. . . . and completing a degree. (BO8)

(Note: LEAD was not a degree program but, for certain individuals, it was up to one-third of coursework needed for a 45 quarter hour specialist degree.)

Responses to a second question on the first year survey help to add understanding to the internship and coursework highlights. Participants were asked how LEAD prepared them to begin the practice of education leadership. Three types of responses accounted for 90% of the responses of the 23 (27/30) individuals in formal leadership: 1) by providing opportunity to experience leadership through the internship; 2) by providing the knowledge that undergirds practice -- through the coursework; and 3) expanding vision. Those same three types of responses accounted for three-fourths of the "hows"reported by those not in formal leadership positions. (See Table 2).

Table 2. Ways LEAD Prepared for Practice as Reported by Participants in Formal Leadership Positions and those Not

WAYS	Responses of Participants In Formal Leadership (N=23)			Responses of Participants Not In Formal Leadership (N=22)			Total (N=45)		
	F	%Total Responses	%Respondents	F	%Total Responses	%Respondents	F	%Total	%Respondents
Opportunity to experience leadership	14	47	61	9	31	41	23	39	51
Provide a knowledge base	9	30	39	10	34	45	19	32	22
Expanding vision	4	13	17	2	7	10	6	10	13
Build confidence	-			3	10	14	3	5	7
Polish leadership skills	-			2	7	10	2	3	16
Other	3	10	NA	3	10	NA	6	10	NA
Total	30	100	NA	29	99	NA	59	99	NA

Individual responses are instructive as to specifically how the opportunity to experience leadership was important.

The internship was living the job. I evolved into a leader as the weeks of the internship progressed. (AO4)

The internship was very helpful because it gave me the opportunity to practice being in a leadership role. (DO9)

Being able to practice educational leadership in a "safe" environment made my first year fairly easy. . . . (BO2)

Just like practice teaching (and motherhood!). It's not real until you do it. . . . (BO3)

. . . . Internship valuable in providing first hand "on-the-job" training. (DO5)

I was able (in my job this year) to "hit the ground running." I was able to bring something to the leadership team (I am joining) and they are treating me as an equal member instead of a child to raise. (DO1)

The internship was valuable experience and helped me make a decision to pursue a leadership position. (DO7)

. . . .(the internship). A definite "eye opening" experience which helps one make a good decision whether to continue (or not) in the leadership field. (CO6)

This opportunity to experience provided individuals with a safe opportunity (BO2) to grow into leadership (AO4, DO9), to be legitimated (DO1), to confirm a decision (CO6, DO7), and to complete the necessary cycle of learning -- from idea to reality (BO3, DO5).

Many of the "providing a knowledge base" responses were just that general. Others, however, were more specific in terms of how it was useful. One (AO1) said it provided the knowledge with which to solve problems. Two (CO6, DO6) used the phrase theoretical preparation -- in supervision and administration. Another was quite specific (CO3) by identifying skills in organizing meetings and making presentations to groups.

A third question on the first year GLS instrument was phrased different for those in and those not in leadership. For those in formal leadership positions, the question was "Can you identify differences in the way you view the nature/challenge of leadership?" Those not in formal leadership were asked to identify ways in which they approach work differently.

One type of response accounted for one-third of the responses (8/21, 2NR). Individuals reported that they now see leadership as more complex and challenging than before LEAD. This was stated as simply as its "more of a challenge than what I thought" (AO1) and as complex as the challenge of understanding the culture of the school while trying to change the expectations of individuals in that culture and managing day-to-day routines (DO1).

Specific mention of the importance of time was identified by school leaders and a greater than "expected" salience of the administrator similarly was noted by three. "I am shocked at how a new principal/different leadership style could change a schools' climate" (BO2) was the way one individual reported it. Three newly prepared LEAD participants also reported their perception of the critical significance of teachers: "Need

to gain a deeper understanding of how and what teachers want to happen educationally for their students", e.g.,(D11).

The response of five of seventeen LEAD completers in their first year back in the same role (not in leadership) to the question about ways in which they approach work differently revealed direct transfer from leadership to teaching. One responded, e.g.,"I remember techniques and skills I have learned and try to put them to use" (BO5). Another wrote, "I evaluate what I do from an administrative perspective. This helps me to improve my teaching". (DO5).

The more common response however (9 of 17) revealed a difference in perspective about the work environment not the work itself. Essentially that change is to take on the administrative perspective: to see the whole school picture (A10); to see a broader view (CO3); to be more aware of what goes into decisions (CO4); to be more aware of the roles of staff, the leadership team, and teachers (CO9).

Finally GLS survey data provide information about preparation from another perspective, namely what do those in formal leadership positions wish had been included that was not. In contrast to prior data which came only from the first year survey, data are available on this question from 23 individuals in year one, 17 in year 2, 15 in year 3, and 9 (via interviews) in year 4.

In the first year after preparation, three items accounted for almost two - thirds (18) of the 28 responses:

Internship in more than one school (6/28)

Opportunity to interact with more administrators (principals and central office) (7/28)

More Gwinnett/specific job skills focus: policies, procedures, tasks (5/28).

In the second year, two responses to the same question accounted for almost three-fourth of the 26 responses: more school law (9/26) and more Gwinnett/specific job focus (10/26).

In the third year, the same two responses accounted for almost two-thirds of the 22 responses: more school law (6/22) and more Gwinnett/specific job focus (7/22). In the fourth year, more school law was as the only response of more than two individuals. Nine school leaders from the first cohort are now in formal leadership roles (as of Fall, 1992). Of the twelve mention, five identified school law and finance was mentioned by more than one school leader and it by two.

Throughout the four years, the essence of the law response was captured by a third year leader (BO8) who responded, "(more) school law; a large part of my work is discipline and I need to understand what can/cannot be done". The salience of a longer internship or otherwise more interaction with administrators disappeared from the responses after year one. The interest in more Gwinnett School District or skills, tasks associated with a specific job descriptions for an assistant principalship also disappeared after the third year.

Kahrs Annual Evaluation Data

Data reported in this section came from interim reports prepared by Kahrs (personal communication, 1989, 1990, 1991) which address the coursework, the internship, and the program as a whole. Kahrs' data were collected via interviews.

The purpose of these annual evaluations was (primarily) to identify areas for improvement rather that judgments about effectiveness per se. Nowhere is that reflected more clearly than with respect to the internship. The internship began (by design) with the principal and intern having virtually unlimited flexibility to structure the activities of the internship. After the first year, Kahrs recommended a basic case of activities with a concentration on instructional supervision (personal communication, 1989 p.8). General planning of activities occurred during the second year, including a requirement that there be internship activities in instructional supervision. Kahrs' subsequent interviewing led to recommendations calling again for "a basic core of activities" and "close coordination between the professor of (the instructional supervision course) and the professor responsible for the internship" (1990, p.6-7). In year three, a specific set of required activities were identified and the supervision course was moved to the same quarter as the internship. The third year evaluation prepared by Kahrs (personal communication, 1991) was silent on these recommendations.

While the decision to delete the professional development seminar and add a course in school business management for the third year of the program was made prior to Kahrs' evaluation following the second preparation cohort, (April and September, 1990, respectively), recommendations from the first (1989) and the second years (1990) were consistent with that decision. More specifically, it was consistent with Kahrs' second year data which suggested integrating the four seminars (a reduced number) with the course on staff development (personal communication, 1990, p.3).

All three of the annual reports submitted by Kahrs to the School District program directors contained the summary judgment that "the program was a positive experience for all and that it met and surpassed expectations and goals established by Gwinnett County "(personal communication, 1989, p.1 and 1990, p.1) or "for the most part, met the goals that had been established by Gwinnett County" (personal communication, 1991, p.1). The major goal identified by Kahrs was to increase the pool of certified leadership personnel. He cites statistics about the number of LEAD candidates to go through administrative screening and selected for leadership positions as evidence. After three hiring seasons (beginning of 1991) spanning opportunities for 39 LEAD participants to be employed, 21 were selected for leadership position: into an assistant principal or an administrative assistant position. (For two years, '89 and '90, the instructional lead teacher position was available; in 1991, all ILT's "became" AP's and the position was no longer used). Now, after four hiring seasons and "hiring opportunities" for 53 participants, 28 have been employed (Carver, 1993). After the first three years, seven of the 39 participants elected not to participate in District screening for placement in a leadership position.

Discussion

The LEAD program can clearly be seen as consistent with calls for preparation that go beyond teaching courses about leadership to include direct and focused attention to field based learning, including being done in close cooperation with a local school district (Griffith, Stout, Forsyth, 1988; Goodlad, 1984; Cornett, 1986; and the Report of National Policy Board, 1989). All the data presented point to its being successful in

that regard. While neither responses from GLS instruments nor the Kahrs interviews are useful in answering the ultimate effectiveness question -- did the program prepare for effective practice or did it prepare better than some other program, responses from participants (GLS data) and participants, program directors, and other District and University personnel (Kahrs data) support the program for its strong basic content, direct field based learning, the use of the cohort as an intact learning group, and portray it as an exemplary joint university - school district effort.

Reports about the value of the internship are to be expected given the general support for field experiences in teacher education and leadership preparation (Guyton and McIntyre, 1990, and Daresh, 1987, 1988, and 1992). Participants' comments about the internship as a highlight and descriptions of how the program prepared for practice revealed support for the five possible purposes of the practicum identified by Daresh (1987): making career choices, refining goals, engaging in realistic practice, increase personal competence, and promoting personal professional development. Especially are the data supportive of redefining goals (expanding vision), engaging in realistic practice, and increasing personal competence. For certain individuals, the internship was instrumental in career choice discussions (DO7 and CO6, e.g.). The beginning of a lifelong network of friends and colleagues was second only to the internship as a highlight of the preparation. It is too early to speak with any authority about the persistence of those relationship but there is some evidence of persistence (Beasely, Charron, and White, 1993).

LEAD is an initial pre-service program that leads to a non-renewable leadership credential from the State. While participants are required to hold a masters degree prior to entry, a requirement that is consistent with the National Policy Board recommendation (1989), completion of LEAD does not directly produce a post-master's degree for an individual. It is, however, the required first step toward a post-master's degree that is necessary for a renewable credential to practice. As difficult as it may be to deliver a program like LEAD, it is easier because it is not a degree program. The graduate school and others who establish and hold academic standards for post master's degree programs are only minimally involved.

Finally, there is the half full, half-empty glass perceptual issue related to the success of LEAD. As reported, after four hiring seasons that provided opportunities for four cohorts to be employed in a leadership position, 28 of 53 (53%) were employed. The District appears to be quite pleased with that rate of placement. Some individuals among the non-employed 25 are not so positive and have indicated they would no longer seek a leadership position in Gwinnett (Carver, 1993). It appears that only LEAD rookies get special attention. Of the twenty-eight participants in leadership positions, only three were selected in the second, third, or fourth year after preparation (Carver, 1993).

LEAD works for the District, for the University, and for most, but not all participants. It bears special watching that this phenomenon does not disrupt in-program positive experiences, especially vis-a-vis collegial relationships among participants, nor develop a negative climate among those not selected. To date that has

not occurred to any significant degree. The District's continuous and pervasive attention to leadership development for all professional personnel and the emphasis on an avowed purpose of the program to help participants make career decisions are certainly some of the reasons. This is another of the interesting issues to be followed in the on-going research about LEAD.

References

Beasley, J., Charron, M.A.,& White, J. (1993). Individual journeys: During preparation and beyond. In-depth discussion paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA.

Bruce, R.E. (1993). Leadership enhancement and development (LEAD): A flourishing product of school and university collaboration. In-depth discussion paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA.

Carver, F.D. (1993). A brief report on the Georgia LEAD Study. Paper presented at the January LEAD Seminar, Athens, GA.

Cornett, L.M. (1986). Effective school principals. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board.

Criteria for preparation programs in the leadership field of administration and supervision (1989). Atlanta: Georgia Department of Education.

Daresh, J.C. (1987). Major assumptions of the practicum to prepare administrators: How valid are they? Paper presented at the Thirtieth Anniversary Convention of the University Council for Educational Administration, Charlottesville, VA.

Daresh, J.C. (1988). The preservice preparation of American educational administrators: Retrospect and prospect. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the British Educational Management and Administration Society, Cardiff, Wales.

Daresh, J.C. & Playko, M.A. (1992). The professional development of school administrators. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Goodlad, J. (1984). A place called school. N.Y.:McGraw-Hill.

Griffith, D.E., Stout, R.T.,& Forsyth, P.B. (1988). Leaders for America's schools: The report and papers of the national commission on excellence in educational administration. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Guyton, E., & McIntyre, J. (1990). Student teaching and school experiences in Houston, R. (Ed.) Handbook of Research on Teacher Education. N.Y.:McMillan.

Improving the preparation of school administrators: An agenda for reform (1989). Charlottesville, VA.: National Policy Board for Educational Administration.

Parkay, F.W.,Currie, G.D.,& Rhodes, J.W. (1992). Professional socialization: A longitudinal study of first-time high school principals. Educational Administration Quarterly, 28(1), 43-75.

Parkay, F.W.,& Hall, G.E. (Eds.). 1992. Becoming a principal: The challenges of beginning leadership. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Parkay, F.W., Rhodes, J., & Currie, G. (1990). Early career development concerns: A longitudinal study of twelve high school principals. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Ryan, K., Newman, K., Mager, G., Applegate, J., Lasler, T., Flora, R., & Johnston, J. (1980). Biting the apple: Accounts of first year teachers. New York: Longman.

Schon, D.A. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. N.Y.: Basic Books.

_____ (1987). Educating the reflective practitioner. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

_____ (Ed.) (1991). The reflective turn: Case studies in and on educational practice. N.Y.: Teachers College Press.

Teacher certification in Georgia: Requirements and regulations for the certification of teachers and school personnel (1979). Atlanta: Georgia Department of Education.

Weindling, D., & Earley, P. (1987). Secondary headship: The first year. Windsor, England: NFER-Nelson.

Note:

James Kahrs was a doctoral student and graduate assistant in Supervision at the University of Georgia, 1988-1990. In 1990, he was hired into Gwinnett County Schools as Assistant Principal at Duluth High School. The personal communications from Kahrs that were cited in the text were memoranda to the District/Program Director in early Fall, 1989, 1990, and 1991. The Program Director personally collected data in 1992 but it has not yet been analyzed.